



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,731	04/30/2001	George Jackowski	2132.029	3804

21917 7590 08/07/2003

MCHALE & SLAVIN, P.A.
2855 PGA BLVD
PALM BEACH GARDENS, FL 33410

EXAMINER

SMITH, CAROLYN L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1631

20

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/845,731

Applicant(s)

JACKOWSKI ET AL.

Examiner

Carolyn L Smith

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 36-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 36-43 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 36-43 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 30 May 2003 is: a) ☐ approved b) ☒ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 16.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' election with traverse of Group I (claims 1 and 2), the cancellation of claims 2-35, and the addition of claims 36-43 in Paper No. 19, filed 5/30/03, are acknowledged. Claims 36-43 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected subject matter.

Applicants' traversal is on the grounds that new claims 36-43 should be combined with Group I as they relate to methods and kits of the elected biomarker.

The applicants' request to combine claims 1 and 36-43 into one invention was found unpersuasive because of the following reasons:

Currently claims 36-43 are drawn to different subject matter than Group I. It is acknowledged that rejoinder practice under *In re Ochiai and Brouwer* will be practiced if product claim 1 is found to be in allowable form. Inventions in Group I and new claims 36-43 are related as product and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP §806.05(h)). In the instant case the biomarker of Group I may be utilized in distinct usages as needed in claims 36-40 in a method for diagnosing myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, and intracerebral hemorrhage, in a diagnostic kit as in claims 41-43, or alternatively, in a pharmaceutical composition. All of these usages are distinct as requiring distinct and different functions thereof without overlapping search due to different subject matter. This lack of overlapping searches documents the undue search burden if they were searched together.

Art Unit: 1631

The requirements are still deemed proper and are therefore made FINAL.

Applicant is hereby notified that the required timing for the correction of drawings has changed. The transmittal letter of Paper No. 17, filed 5/30/03, states that 3 formal drawings have been submitted. The letter was actually accompanied by 4 formal drawings. The fourth drawing is objected to by the Examiner as it contains numbers that are written upside down and backwards. Due to the above notification Applicant is required to submit drawing corrections within the time period set for responding to this Office action. Failure to respond to this requirement may result in abandonment of the instant application or a notice of a failure to fully respond to this Office action.

Claim 1 (amended) is herein under examination.

PATENTABLE UTILITY GUIDELINES

The pending claims have been reviewed in light of the Utility Examination Guidelines and Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1092-1111, Friday, January 5, 2001.

The examiner is using the following definitions in evaluating the claims for utility.

"Specific" - A utility that is *specific* to the subject matter claimed. This contrasts with a *general* utility that would be applicable to the broad class of the invention.

"Substantial" - A utility that defines a "real world" use. Utilities that require or constitute carrying out further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use are not substantial utilities.

"Credible" - Credibility is assessed from the perspective of one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the disclosure and any other evidence of record that is probative of the applicant's assertions. That is, the assertion is an inherently unbelievable undertaking or involves implausible scientific principles.

Art Unit: 1631

"Well-established" - a specific, substantial, and credible utility which is well known, immediately apparent, or implied by the specification's disclosure of the properties of a material, alone or taken with the knowledge of one skilled in the art.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility due to its not being supported by a specific, substantial, and credible utility or, in the alternative, a well-established utility.

The claimed polynucleotide is not supported by a substantial utility, because no substantial utility has been adequately established for the claimed subject matter. The specification states the biomarker can be used "in diagnostic assays for the detection of the particularly isolated disease specific marker sequences of the present invention" (page 31, lines 10-12); however, the tests performed appear to use only serum samples from patients suffering from a variety of disease states without any mention of the use of controls to verify the marker sequence to be disease specific. While the specification mentions use of control samples for the antibody assays (page 33, line 1), no mention is made of control samples in comparison the actual claimed biomarker from alleged diseased states. SEQ ID NO: 1 may indeed be a diagnostic for myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, and intracerebral hemorrhage; however, further research would be required to confirm a "real world" context of use.

Art Unit: 1631

Applicant should explicitly identify a specific, substantial, and credible utility for the claimed invention and establish a probative relation between any evidence of record and the originally disclosed properties of the claimed invention.

Due to a lack of either an art recognized or alleged well established utility, the instant invention has been rejected due to also lacking the required combination of a specific, substantial, and credible utility. Again, although it may be credible that SEQ ID NO: 1 may indeed be a diagnostic for myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, and intracerebral hemorrhage, the lack of a substantial utility, as explained above, sufficiently supports this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized in *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986) and reiterated by the Court of Appeals in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 at 1404 (CAFC 1988). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount or direction presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. The Board also stated that although the level of the skill in molecular

Art Unit: 1631

biology is high, the results of experiments in genetic engineering are unpredictable. While all of these factors are considered, a sufficient amount for a *prima facie* case are discussed below.

LACK OF ENABLEMENT

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the claimed invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would not know how to use any asserted specific or substantial utility of the claimed biomarker when the patient samples have not been appropriately compared to controls from which to draw valid conclusions of use.

Without further data or sound scientific reasoning, it appears speculative whether the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 1 plays a role in any of the asserted utilities as discussed above in the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection without adequate comparison to control data from which sound conclusions may be drawn. With this in mind, additional evidence is necessary in order to satisfy the current lack of enablement. Several options exist to overcome this lack of enablement issue, such as supplying additional data or other scientific reasoning that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to be able to make and/or use the present invention.

Also, since the claimed invention is not supported by a specific, substantial, and credible utility or a well-established utility for the reasons set forth above (refer to the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection), one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1631

No claim is allowed.


Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR §1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is either (703) 308-4242 or (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn Smith, whose telephone number is (703) 308-6043. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached on (703) 308-4028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instruments Examiner Tina Plunkett whose telephone number is (703) 305-3524 or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

August 4, 2003


ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER